

REMARKS

The Office Action of 06/01/2007 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 10, 14, 17 and 18 were rejected as being unpatentable over Houlihan in view of Sonoda. Claims 2, 6, 8, 11, 15 and 16 were rejected as being unpatentable over the same combination further in view of McLean. The claims have been amended to more clearly distinguish over the cited reference. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In particular, the claims have been amended to recite in part a physically-shortened electric antenna that is physically smaller in at least one dimension than its electrical length in that same dimension, the physically-shortened electric antenna being mounted such that the one dimension of the physically-shortened electric antenna is aligned with a height of a casing, the height being less than the width and length of the casing. Where the physically-shortened electric antenna is a helical antenna as recited in claim 2, for example, the foregoing features are present when a central axis of the helical antenna is aligned with the height dimension of the casing. The claims continue to recite that the physically shortened electric antenna is designed so as to not require manipulation by a user.

Sonoda does not teach or suggest a physically-shortened electric antenna that is physically smaller in at least one dimension than its electrical length in that same dimension, the physically-shortened electric antenna being mounted such that the one dimension of the physically-shortened electric antenna is aligned with a height of a casing. In the case of Sonoda, the antenna is planar. It is not physically situated in a plane. Rather, *in the plane*, its physical length and its electrical length are *the same*.

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1, 2, 4-12 and 14-18 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Ure, Reg. 33,089

Dated: 09/04/2007